

~~SECRET~~

53

4th December, 1959.

COCOM Document 3716.58/1

COORDINATING COMMITTEE

RECORD OF DISCUSSION

ON

ITEM 1658 - MOLYBDENUM

25th and 30th November, 1959.

Present: Belgium(Luxembourg), Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, United Kingdom, United States.

References: COCOM Docs. Nos. 3700.3, 3716.00/1 and W.P. 1658/1.

1. The FRENCH Delegation suggested that the Note to sub-item (b) be redefined to read:

NOTE: This item does not cover clean wire of a diameter not exceeding 800 microns and which, after having been fully annealed, has an elongation factor not exceeding 12%."

2. The CANADIAN, GERMAN, ITALIAN, JAPANESE and UNITED KINGDOM Delegations agreed to this proposal. The NETHERLANDS Delegation were prepared to accept it ad referendum if it secured unanimous agreement, while expressing some doubt as to whether the 800 micron cut-off was sufficiently restrictive.

3. The UNITED STATES Delegation were unable to accept the French proposal since they believed that the present definition, which had resulted from lengthy study by competent technicians, provided cut-offs to exclude wire which would be impracticable for redrawing or reworking for electronic purposes. They therefore saw no technical basis for modifying the present definition.

4. The FRENCH Delegation explained that their technical services had given very thorough consideration to this question. They adduced lengthy technical arguments to prove that their suggestion for a diameter cut-off of 800 microns and an elongation factor cut-off of 12% would only free the molybdenum wire used in incandescent lamps. Under their proposal, wire of strategic significance, i.e. that used in electronic tubes, would remain under embargo.

5. The UNITED KINGDOM Delegation, in corroborating the French Delegation's arguments, noted that, since the French proposal referred to "clean" wire, in their view the same objective would be attained if mention were made of the 800 micron diameter cut-off only, without any reference whatsoever to the elongation factor. The GERMAN Delegation shared this view, but the FRENCH Delegation felt that it went beyond the aim of their own proposal.

6. Delegations undertook to report the technical arguments which had been put forward to their Governments.

7. CONCLUSION : The COMMITTEE noted that agreement had not been reached on Item 1658, and agreed to resume study of it during the second round of discussion.

SPG.

~~SECRET~~